

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 3-17 are now pending in the application. Claim 2 has been canceled herein without prejudice. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

L. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on a combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,655 ("Brooks") and U.S. Patent No. 5,420,406 ("Izawa"). All pending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the following reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

One of the features recited in independent claims 1, 9, 10, and 17 is directed to notification of invalidating the document. For example, independent claim 1 requires a controller, *inter alia*, "to send data *representing completion of the invalidation* of the document to the server." Other independent claims contain recitations similar to those of independent claim 1. As described at, for example, page 16, lines 25-31 of the present specification, a specific exemplary embodiment of the invention involves a notification process where the printer controller 111 sends a message containing data 738 indicating completion of cutting the document to the content server 120 so that the content server 120 can initiate a refund process in exchange for the destroyed document. As such, according to an exemplary embodiment of the invention, such "data representing completion of the invalidation of the document" sent to the server can be an event for the server to trigger an important event (e.g., a refund or a billing transaction in general).

The Brooks patent was cited as describing the claimed "send[ing] data representing completion of the invalidation of the document to the server." The Office Action, in its Response to Arguments section, cited various portions of the Brooks patent as describing the above-identified claimed feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited portion generally describes generating alarm based on validity criteria (column 3, lines 41-55). However, nothing in the Brooks patent suggests data representing completion of invalidation of the document as claimed. Most importantly, the cited portions including column 3, lines 41-55 are related to generation of an alarm when a printed replacement substrate does not meet the validity criteria. See also, column 4, lines 55-64 for the definition of the "validity criteria." Such decision based on the validity criteria for a printed ticket has nothing to do with the claimed completion of invalidation.

In addition, the Brooks patent describes that such an alarm can be generated when a voided substrate is dispensed. However, as opposed to the claimed invention, according to Brooks, the voided substrate is dispensed to the recipient. In other words, in the Brooks system, the voided ticket can be returned to a user. This description of Brooks contradicts the claimed invention because, according to the invention, once invalidation of the document is performed by cutting the document, the invalidated (or cut) document is not meant to be returned to a recipient. This is clear from the description of the invention throughout the present specification as those skilled in the art would appreciate.

By contrast, the claimed invention requires sending data which represents completion of the invalidation of the document. It is respectfully submitted that, in Brooks' system, a voiding act itself does not trigger any data sending activity. Rather, in Brooks, generation of an alarm is triggered based on validity criteria. See also, column 5, lines 22-37. Therefore, mere decision based on validity criteria, or dispensation of a voided ticket cannot be said to teach or suggest the claimed data sending step.

The Izawa patent has been carefully reviewed, and found not to overcome the deficiencies of the Brooks patent as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, the invention defined in independent claims 1, 9, 10, and 17, and their dependent claims is believed to be patentable over the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Additionally, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended herein to further clarify one of the aspects of the invention. Specifically, independent claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, "a network interface for coupling the printer to a network, wherein the controller is operable to send the authentication data to the server via the network, and send the data representing completion to the server via the network." Independent claim 17 contain recitations similar to those of claim 1.

In rejecting previously presented claim 2, the Action cited column 2, lines 47-57 of the Brooks patent. Again, as discussed in the above paragraphs, the Brooks patent fails to teach or suggest the claimed authentication data which is sent to the server via the network, as claimed. Brooks also fails to teach or suggest the claimed data representing completion which is sent to the server via the network, as claimed.

The cited portion merely describes an audible alarm, a displayed message, and an automatic page. These conventional alarms have nothing to do with the claimed data sent to the server via the network. Therefore, the Brooks patent cannot be said to affect the patentability of independent claims 1 and 17 in this regard as well.


Appln. No.: 09/898,875
Atty Docket: ALPSP020/M US00995

7

II. CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance at an early date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 510-663-1100, ext. 245.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Haruo Yawata
Limited Recognition No. L0109

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
510-663-1100, ext. 245